

2001

A Study to Determine the Characteristics for Inclusion in the Faculty Recruitment Process at the Appalachian School of Law

Veronica Keene
Old Dominion University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/ots_masters_projects

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Keene, Veronica, "A Study to Determine the Characteristics for Inclusion in the Faculty Recruitment Process at the Appalachian School of Law" (2001). *OTS Master's Level Projects & Papers*. 224.
https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/ots_masters_projects/224

This Master's Project is brought to you for free and open access by the STEM Education & Professional Studies at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in OTS Master's Level Projects & Papers by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.

**A STUDY TO DETERMINE THE CHARACTERISTICS FOR INCLUSION IN
THE FACULTY RECRUITMENT PROCESS AT THE APPALACHIAN
SCHOOL OF LAW**

A Research Paper
Presented to the Graduate Faculty of the
Department of Occupational and Technical Studies
at Old Dominion University

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the
Master of Science Degree

By
Veronica Keene
November 2001

SIGNATURE PAGE

This research paper was prepared by Veronica Keene under the direction of Dr. John M. Ritz in OTED 636, Problems in Occupational and Technical Studies. It was submitted to the Graduate Program Director as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Science in Occupational and Technical Studies.

APPROVED BY: John M. Ritz 11-30-01
Dr. John M. Ritz
Advisor and Graduate Program Director
Occupational and Technical Studies
Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are numerous people to acknowledge and thank for their contributions to this research study. I would first like to thank my research advisor, Dr. John M. Ritz, Old Dominion University, for his help, guidance, encouragement and patience throughout the research.

I appreciate the time and input of the current faculty members of the Appalachian School of Law. Without their support and assistance, this research would not have been possible.

My personal appreciation is given to Dean L. Anthony Sutin and President Lucius F. Ellsworth for allowing me to take time out of my work schedule to attend class and work on my research paper.

Finally, I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to my husband and my children who always provided love, support, and understanding.

Veronica Keene

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SIGNATURE PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
TABLE.....	24
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	1
RESEARCH GOALS	1-2
BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE.....	2-4
LIMITATIONS.....	4
ASSUMPTIONS.....	4-5
PROCEDURES.....	5-6
DEFINITION OF TERMS	6
OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS.....	7
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	8
RECRUITMENT OPTIONS	8
SOLICITED GROUP.....	8-11
UNSOLICITED GROUP.....	11-13
RECRUITMENT CHARACTERISTICS.....	13-18
SUMMARY	18
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES.....	19
POPULATION.....	19
INSTRUMENT DESIGN	19-20

DATA COLLECTION	20
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS	21
SUMMARY.....	21-22
IV. FINDINGS.....	23
SURVEY RESPONSE.....	23
POPULATION	23-24
RESEARCH FINDINGS	24-33
SUMMARY.....	33-34
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	34
SUMMARY	35-36
CONCLUSIONS.....	36
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY	38-39
APPENDICES	40-50

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Appalachian School of Law (ASL) is a newly developed educational institution located in Buchanan County, in the town of Grundy, Virginia. Many individuals as well as state and local groups have supported the development of the Law School. The objective of the Law School is to provide the best possible educational program for the purpose of preparing individuals to become professional lawyers.

In order to fulfill that objective and because of the relative newness of the law school, many policies are being developed which will help establish ASL as a quality institution. The recruitment of quality faculty members is a very important component for the success of the institution. For this reason, it is necessary to develop the best possible course for recruiting faculty members for the Appalachian School of Law.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this project was to recommend the best criteria to be used in the selection of faculty applicants for the Appalachian School of Law.

RESEARCH GOALS

The objective of this project is to recommend the best criteria using either the solicited or unsolicited method for the selection of faculty candidates when recruiting faculty members at the Appalachian School of Law. The criteria or characteristics need to be evaluated and a recommendation made to the Faculty Recruitment Committee to include specific characteristics in the evaluation and implementation of faculty

recruitment policies. Therefore, the research goal of this project will be to:

- (1) Review the solicited method,
- (2) Review the unsolicited method,
- (3) Determine what are the best criteria for faculty,
- (4) Submit a recommendation to the Faculty Recruitment Committee to include in their faculty recruitment process.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The Appalachian School of Law (ASL) is an independent, not-for-profit educational institution located in Grundy, Virginia. Governed by a Board of Trustees, the Law School provides a quality program for the professional preparation of lawyers---the Juris Doctorate or J. D. degree. The general curriculum emphasizes administrative law, particularly alternate dispute resolution.

This relatively small law school maintains a learning environment centered on students. Students and faculty also contribute to the community through service activities. The Appalachian School of Law students are predominantly from the five-state region and are both traditional and non-traditional with respect to age. Their diverse backgrounds enrich the institution's educational mission.

The location of the Appalachian School of Law, in the rural mountainous section of Southwest Virginia, influences the school's ability to recruit qualified professors. This is a remote section of the Appalachian region that has experienced a decline in population and employment opportunities. The economic and physical characteristics of this region greatly affect the choice of individuals seeking faculty options.

The Appalachian School of Law has not adopted a faculty selection process for the purpose of selecting the best possible candidates for available faculty positions. Due to the newness of the Law School, the selection process is being improvised and improved upon at the same time as the ongoing process of staffing the faculty positions for this year and future years. The current status of hiring faculty candidates and the need to hire future candidates denotes the urgency for developing a selection process for hiring faculty for the Law School.

The Board of Trustees and employees of the Appalachian School of Law are committed to the development of a quality educational program. An important part of the development of this program is to employ a superior faculty. A high volume of resumes and vitas are mailed to the school; therefore, the Law School has not needed to advertise to fill faculty positions. In addition, the Law School is a member of the Association of American Law Schools (AALS) and participates in the annual recruitment conference held in Washington, D.C. Although there are several candidates who apply directly to the ASL and there is an abundance of applicants who interview for faculty positions at the AALS, there is no specific selection process that is used or implemented for the purpose of selecting faculty members. The current form of selecting faculty candidates is a smorgasbord of the different options. This unorganized conglomerate of options needs to be evaluated to discern the best possible course for selecting faculty candidates. The fact that no policy exists and the lack of clear directions or policies for recruiting faculty members illustrates the significance of the research project. Although the Law School has established a Faculty Recruitment Committee, there is no policy or procedure for the committee to follow. The development and implementation of a faculty recruitment

policy along with specific selection characteristics or criteria would eliminate unnecessary time and expense.

LIMITATIONS

The administrative limitations of this study include administrative approval, and implementation by Faculty Recruitment Committee. The general limitations of this study were as follows:

- (1) The material available in the literature on recruitment,
- (2) Solicited and unsolicited application processes
- (3) The Appalachian School of Law, and
- (4) Ability to attract quality applicants due to the remote location of the Appalachian School of Law.

ASSUMPTIONS

This study was based on the assumption that a recommendation of specific selection criteria for recruiting faculty candidates would provide or improve upon the number and selection of qualified faculty applicants. The study was conducted to recommend to Law School administration the best criteria for recruiting faculty applicants.

The researcher expects to find that certain criteria are preferred which will enable the Law School to hire faculty members. This project is conducted under the assumption that the researcher will be able to establish common criteria from the literature review

that can be used for the comparison of the two methods of faculty recruitment, solicited and unsolicited.

The researcher assumes that once the research project is reviewed, the Faculty Recruitment Committee will implement or include the result of the findings in the law school's faculty recruitment process. Once this method is determined and implemented, the Law School will save money and time when recruiting faculty candidates.

PROCEDURES

This research project will develop a list of hiring criteria from the literature. It will compare the criteria of the solicited method to the criteria of the unsolicited method of faculty recruitment. This will lead to a recommendation to the Faculty Recruitment Committee for implementing a recruitment process for hiring new faculty members.

The fact that the Law School is currently hiring and needs to hire several additional faculty members leads it to its current issue of how to select the best possible candidates for full-time faculty (tenured) positions. As previously discussed, data will be used to examine and compare the two methods of faculty application. The methods include recruitment of faculty members from the solicited group or the unsolicited group. Common and uncommon criteria for the different options will be used in the evaluation of this study. The researcher will develop a questionnaire that will be distributed to the current ASL faculty to determine what the faculty perceives to be the best criteria. The criteria will be compared and contrasted in order to establish which criterion will be recommended for the faculty recruitment process. Therefore, the objective for this project is to recommend the best criteria to be used in the faculty recruitment process at

the Appalachian School of Law.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

This section provides the definition for the terms which will be used repeatedly throughout the research project.

(1) The American Bar Association (ABA) is the accrediting association for all law schools. The ABA accreditation directly affects the success or failure of an institution. A Law School needs to be accredited by the ABA in order to acquire federal government funded student loans, both subsidized and unsubsidized. The ABA is the accrediting agency which is recognized by all fifty state's Board of Bar Examiners.

(2) The Association of American Law Schools (AALS) is a non-profit organization of 162 law schools which was formed to promote legal education. The AALS is also noted for their annual recruitment conference that is held in Washington, D.C.

(3) Faculty Recruitment Conference refers to the AALS recruitment conference which occurs annually in Washington, D.C. To the chagrin of the AALS, the recruitment conference is more commonly referred to as the "Meat Market". This is the largest assembly of interested faculty candidates and the most popular method of faculty recruitment used by the majority of institutions.

(4) The Order of the Coif is a national scholastic honor society in law. Membership in the Order of the Coif is the highest accolade a law student may achieve. It is equivalent to membership in Phi Beta Kappa for undergraduates, recognizing the scholastic achievement of students selected from the upper ten percent of their class.

OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS

Chapter I provided an explanation for the need to research the faculty recruitment options for the Appalachian School of Law. The two primary resources, solicited and unsolicited options was discussed and reviewed. The solicited option includes the American Association of Law Schools Faculty Recruitment Conference in Washington, D.C. The unsolicited option includes all unadvertised applicants, friends or acquaintances of associates and faculty members who are interested in joining the Appalachian School of Law faculty and other applicants who are seeking employment.

Chapter I also provided the problem statement, research goals, limitations and assumptions. The procedures for the research were briefly explained and related terms were defined.

A review of the literature will be provided in Chapter II. Chapter III will provide an explanation of the methods and procedures used to obtain the research data. Chapter IV will state the findings. Finally, Chapter V will provide a summary with conclusions and recommendations based upon the study. Criteria or characteristics to be used in the faculty recruitment process will ultimately be recommended to the Faculty Recruitment Committee. This project is a fundamental requirement if the Law School is to discover the best criteria for selecting quality faculty members. Upon completion of this project, the Appalachian School of Law will then have the necessary information to determine the best characteristics for inclusion in the faculty recruitment process.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will present information from other resources that have developed regarding the faculty recruitment processes. The faculty recruitment methods include the American Association of Law School's Faculty Recruitment Conference (solicited) and unsolicited applicants. The literature review will discuss common and uncommon criteria which can be used to compare the methods. The inclusion of general information will provide background for the reader and help establish a foundation for the faculty selection process.

RECRUITMENT OPTIONS

The two main methods for faculty selection of law schools are the American Association of Law School's Faculty Recruitment Conference (solicited) and unsolicited applicants. Both of these methods are incorporated into the current Law School faculty selection process.

SOLICITED GROUP

One method of law faculty selection is through use of the Association of American Law School Annual Faculty Recruitment Conference in Washington, D.C. This will be referred to as the solicited method of faculty recruitment.

This literature review will provide information regarding the role of the Association of American Law School's Annual Faculty Recruitment Conference and what relation it has on the hiring of high quality faculty members for the Appalachian

School of Law. The Association of American Law Schools (AALS) has as its purpose “the improvement of the legal profession through legal education” (Monk, 1997, p. 1).

The AALS recruitment conference has been nicknamed “The Meatmarket,” because of the exhausting and sometimes disappointing experience, for both the recruiters and the candidates (Zillman, Angel, Laitos, Pring, & Tomain, 1988). The recruiting process of AALS begins by sending information to the members of their organization. The AALS also provides deadlines and registration fees for each conference. According to the recent AALS memorandums and newsletters mailed to the ASL, the Association of American Law Schools offers three services to individuals interested in considering faculty positions at law schools: the Faculty Appointments Register, the Placement Bulletin, and the Faculty Recruitment Conference. The Association serves as a median, sending information on candidates via the Faculty Appointments Register and by sending the advertisements for positions at law schools to the candidates via the Placement Bulletin. The Association also sponsors the Annual Faculty Recruitment Conference where schools can interview candidates (Monk, 1997).

The purpose of the AALS Faculty Recruitment Conference (FRC) is to give prospective law school teachers the opportunity to meet and discuss employment opportunities with law school deans and recruitment teams (AALS, www.aals.org). Zenoff and Barron (1983) state that “approximately 90 percent of the approved schools and recruitment teams attend the conference, and a substantial percentage of candidates receive requests for subsequent on-site interviews and job offers” (p. 1715).

After the conference is over, the candidates return home to await a call-back. The interview process will begin again, on the school’s campus, if the candidate is lucky

enough to get a call from one of the recruitment teams. Gordon puts it simply by stating, “after all that, you get to begin the interviewing process all over again” (p. 22). If the candidate is successful, the individual will have the opportunity to go back to the Faculty Recruitment Conference year after year, maybe this time as a recruiter rather than a candidate.

There are many opinions on the viability of the FRC. Zillman and others suggest at least two opinions on the FRC. “The first is how poorly some very well-credentialed candidates handle the hiring process. The second is how little guidance is available on what is expected of candidates. Naturally, we suspect that a post conference gathering of candidates would also agree on how poorly most faculty recruiters interviewed and how little sense many faculty members had of what they should be doing” (Zillman, Angel, Laitos, Pring, & Tomain, 1988).

Some say that the purpose of the interview is to “weed out unqualified applicants instead of a procedure for selecting the best two to six candidates from a pool of twenty-five to fifty” (Zenoff & Barron, 1983, p. 1715). Some candidates also believe that it is unfair for a university to interview applicants when they do not have positions open. For example, if a faculty member is on leave and looking for another position that position can not be filled by a candidate until the existing professor resigns. Yet, the recruitment committee is interviewing candidates at the AALS conference for the possibility of filling that position (Zenoff & Barron, 1983, p. 1715). This may not seem like a problem of merit, however if an applicant is very interested in a specific law school and the recruitment committee discloses equal interest in the applicant, the applicant may miss or eliminate other opportunities by relying on the idea of becoming a faculty member at that

law school.

Chew (1982) believes that there are three basic reasons not to choose the AALS. His reasons are not necessary, too public, and the applicant is captive (pp. 248-249). Chew believes that the AALS is not necessary because he believes in using the existing network more effectively. He recommends the adage of "it's not necessarily what you know, but who you know". When hunting for a job the applicant may not want his/her current employer to know that they are looking elsewhere for employment. Finally, applicants are limited to their geographic area and are only interested in that region. In this case the applicant can contact surrounding universities directly without the use of the AALS Faculty Recruitment Conference.

UNSOLICITED CANDIDATES

The second source of faculty candidates is the unsolicited group of applicants. There are several types of faculty candidates that fit into the unsolicited group of applicants. This group includes the applicants who have taken the initiative to apply directly to the law school, those who have friends or associates working at the law school, others may be in search of a career change, and the remaining applicants may simply want to return to a demographic region.

The Appalachian School of Law receives many applications or resumes each year. These resumes do not come from advertised solicitations. Many people have simply read an article in a local or national magazine concerning the development of the ASL. The candidate often has ties to the region or wants to be a part of the initial faculty. Another source of unsolicited candidates comes from the existing faculty. Most of the existing

faculty have close associations with other professors. This is how the chain of introduction to the Appalachian School of Law begins.

Many unsolicited candidates will mail or fax resumes to the law school. “At the University of Wisconsin literally hundreds of letters expressing interest in a full-time appointment, pour in and must be reviewed” (Thain, p. 67). The resume must be outstanding and persuasive enough to get the attention of the Dean and faculty members, otherwise, submitting of a resume by an applicant does not compare to the personal interview and contact that is established during the AALS Faculty Recruitment Conference.

The current method for processing an unsolicited application begins at the ASL by establishing a file on the applicant. The applicant’s resume is then given to the Dean for review. Once the Dean has read and personally screened the application, it is passed among the faculty members for their inspection. The faculty members are requested to voice their opinions regarding the applicant’s resume. If a faculty member wants to recommend the applicant, the member can request the applicant’s resume and file be one of the items that is placed on the agenda for the next faculty meeting. At the faculty meeting if the applicant is favorably recognized as one with potential, a recommendation to the ASL Faculty Recruitment Committee members may be made to pursue interaction between the applicant and the Law School.

This process does not include the detail that the AALS recruitment process entails. The initial review of the resume is often the only time that attention is significantly directed toward the applicant. Applicants may follow-up the resume by calling or contacting associates of the law school.

RECRUITMENT CHARACTERISTICS

The literature review provided the researcher with additional recruitment qualifications. The sources for this research ranged from journals and articles to personal interviews. The results of the literature review as is related to qualification criteria are as follows.

According to Kogan, Moses and El-Khawas (1994), the academic staff is higher education's most important asset. More than anything else, it is the quality and numbers of its teachers and researchers which affects the ability of a university to teach its students and create and disseminate knowledge. Thus, the selection of faculty members is crucial to a quality law school. "Recruitment is a time-consuming, complex task, and few faculty members recruit often enough to master its intricacies. In addition, it is hard work, requiring many important decisions and offering many opportunities for costly mistakes" (Perlman and McCann, 1996).

Michael Ryan and David Martinson (1996) reiterate the importance of recruiting quality faculty members. Recruiting quality faculty is university's most important activity. Without efficient, knowledgeable, articulate faculty members, a university cannot fulfill its educational potential, even if it boasts the best students and the most outstanding facilities. Perlman and McCann (1996) believe that if you recruit well and your colleague stays in your department for a period of time, the selection of a new hire is easily a million-dollar decision.

One of the factors that can be used for faculty selection is law school rankings. Although faculty selection does not relay solely on law school rank, many individuals

look at the background and alumni of an institution as an indicator of quality faculty applicants. Bruce and Swygert (1981) state that, “one of the most important selection factors is a candidate’s legal education” (p. 243). George Christie (1987) stated that most institutions “purport to compete on a national basis for the best applicants from the top law schools” (p. 306). The AALS warns about placing total emphasis on the ranking of law schools. On February 18, 1998, at a New York City AALS meeting, the AALS speakers called on the U.S. News and World Report to stop ranking law schools. According to the AALS Newsletter, April 1998, a study which was done by Stephen P. Klein concluded “that the methodology used by U.S. News and World Report to compile its law school rankings was flawed” (B. Burke, 1998, p. 7). This illustrates that even some previously recognized criteria which were characterized as viable statistical information for faculty selection is not always accurate.

According to Zenoff and Barron (1983) many law schools use specific criteria for selection of faculty members. They state that “although the emphasis given to any one criterion varies from school to school” some of the criteria are: “class rank, law review experience, law school attended, publications, judicial clerkships, advanced law degrees, law teaching experience, private practice with a major firm and government service” (p. 1714). A faculty member who has continued his/her education is someone who is valued by the academic framework. George Christie (1987) states that “most importantly, a faculty member should be someone who continues to develop intellectually over a lifetime, who will find new things to study and new things to explore over a career that may last upwards to forty years” (p. 311). The fact that advanced degrees are critical to faculty members becomes evident when such importance is placed on the continuing

education of faculty members. Therefore it would appear that a faculty applicant with advanced degrees would definitely be a more desirable candidate for recruitment than an applicant without any additional education. However, Bruce and Swygert (1981) state that while one side argues that advanced degrees “open the door to law teaching for some individuals and permits others to move up the law school ladder, the other side considers an advanced degree to be of little value in obtaining teaching positions, at least at the stronger law schools” (p. 246).

“A law school’s selectivity results from specific curricular demands, research and writing expectations, skill-level requirements and other institutional considerations” (Bruce & Swygert, 1981, p. 222). The Houston Law Review is quoted as stating that “writing for publication is an important aspect of a law teacher’s job” (1981, p. 246). The review further states that two studies indicate that many schools consider publication and law review experience to be essential credentials” (p. 248). According to Christie (1987), “law professors will need to produce scholarly work that will ensure tenure once the individual is hired as a faculty candidate” (p. 310). Christie further states that producing scholarly work can be a “frightening time indeed, particularly for those who have difficulty writing” (p. 310).

Experience, as a law teacher, is another important selection criterion. One method of evaluating a teacher is to review the student evaluations. According to Bruce and Swygert (1981), “some legal educators believe that student perceptions are so clouded by inexperience and the immediate goals of high grades, graduation, and job placement that their evaluations should be discounted” (p. 249). Yet, an individual who has a good track record in the profession is usually preferred over an inexperienced and

unknown applicant with otherwise sparkling credentials. One disadvantage to placing high emphasis on an individual's teaching experience is the fact a school could hesitate to give a talented newcomer a chance.

There are other credentials that a candidate may possess that does not fit into any of the other categories, but which may be significant. "One noteworthy credential is the honor of graduating from law school as Order of the Coif", according to The Houston Law Review (1981, p. 255). This award identifies the recipient as one with a top law school record. Bruce and Swygert (1981) mention other helpful credentials which include "success in moot court or client counseling competition, service as a faculty research assistant, and post-graduate employment as an instructor in a clinic or legal writing program" (p. 265).

These are a few factors that need to be considered when making faculty selections. They indicate the many directions and phases of selecting faculty members. In addition to providing criteria for faculty selection, they emphasize the importance of developing a selection process for the purpose of recruiting quality faculty members.

Some general issues that affect the selection of faculty candidates are external trends. "Demographic and economic changes add a critical dimension to the demand for higher education and faculty availability to meet it" (Kircher, p. 66). The Appalachian School of Law is located in a rural, remote and economically depressed community. The candidates who are interested in a teaching position at the ASL are requested to visit the campus and community surrounding the law school. The demographic and economic challenges certainly add to the complexity of the faculty recruitment process for the ASL. These conditions affect the faculty candidates regardless of whether the candidate is

solicited or unsolicited.

Other factors that can be used to evaluate candidates are minorities and quotas for male/female employees, past evaluations from previous employers, and letters of recommendations. These issues are among some of the most prejudiced or preconceived factors which can influence the hiring of a candidate.

Whether the applicant is solicited or unsolicited, before beginning the screening and selection of candidates, the recruitment committee needs to look inward at the academic department. Perlman and McCann state that the recruitment committee should review the departmental history to gain some perspective, evaluate the current situation, and consider the future directions. “Recruitment can be an unexpected and often unappreciated opportunity to take stock, evaluate the institution’s needs, and plan any necessary changes to its programs and physical facilities” (Perlman and McCann, 1996, p. 231).

Kircher (1990) states that regarding Marquette University, it is the further “consideration of whether budget will allow the institution to pursue a seasoned academic lawyer or limit it to an entry level candidate who has great potential but little experience”(p. 65). In 1989, Markoff stated an interviewer said, “we don’t want to expend too much energy on people we can’t get” (p. 116). There must also be a decision to offer the candidate a tenured track position as opposed to a visiting professor that may be offered tenure after a suggested period of time.

SUMMARY

Chapter II, Review of Literature, presented the two primary resources, solicited

and unsolicited options, as well as criteria or characteristics which may be used to select faculty. There was a lack of research in the literature that compares the two sources.

The researcher will discuss in the next chapter, the methods and procedures that will be used to research the faculty recruitment project. A complete description of the population and instrument, as well as the data collection process, will be described and discussed.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Chapter III will describe the methods and procedures used in conducting this study. The chapter includes the population and the instrument design used to gather the data and how it was constructed. This chapter will also provide the data analysis and a summary about the treatment of the data.

POPULATION

The population of this study involved the current faculty of the Appalachian School of Law. A questionnaire was distributed to all of the current full-time faculty members (16) to select the criteria believed to be the best indicators of quality faculty candidates. The questionnaire was collected from 14 of the 16 faculty members. Both male and female faculty members were represented. The population surveyed was between 36 – 57 years of age. All faculty were full-time faculty members.

INSTRUMENT DESIGN

The instrument utilized in this project was in the form of a questionnaire. The survey was designed to minimize the writing requirement of the population.

The questionnaire, Appendix A, asked the respondent to indicate the most important characteristic for the selection of faculty candidates at the Appalachian School of Law. The questionnaire presented twenty-two (22) characteristics and asked the respondent to rank each characteristic by importance. The numerical value was assigned with one (1) being the most important and twenty-two (22) the least important. The

questionnaire also asked the respondent to list additional characteristics that should be considered in the recruitment process.

DATA COLLECTION

The introductions and questionnaires were distributed to all faculty members in August 2001, and the respondents were asked to return the questionnaire within two weeks time. The introduction indicated to the respondents that the questionnaires will remain confidential but the result of the survey will be provided to the Faculty Selection Committee. A copy of the questionnaire (Appendix A) and the introduction (Appendix B) are included in the Appendices section of this research document. The introduction or memo (Appendix B) accompanying the questionnaire explained the purpose and use of the questionnaire responses. The respondent's name, gender, race, or age was not sought for this survey.

In order to randomly collect the data, the researcher asked that the respondent return the questionnaire to the mail room rather than the researcher. The questionnaires were distributed in August 2001 and collected over a two-week period of time. The researcher collected the questionnaires once each week. The deadline for returning the questionnaires was September 10, 2001.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The data collected from the questionnaires were calculated and entered in a table to determine the most popular characteristics for faculty recruitment process of the Appalachian School of Law based on the opinions of current faculty members. The total

number of each individual response was calculated as a percentage and appears in a table.

There is a table provided for each of the twenty-two characteristics along with a statement evaluating the findings. There is a summation for the additional essay question listed on the questionnaire.

SUMMARY

Chapter III presented a description of the population, instrument design, and data collection used to conduct the research. The population and the instrument design were identified. The population included the current faculty members of the Appalachian School of Law. The survey obtained information about the characteristics of the faculty recruitment process for the Appalachian School of Law. The findings of this survey will be presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The goal of this study was to recommend the best criteria to be used for selection of faculty applicants for the Appalachian School of Law. Chapter IV will discuss the findings presented by the survey and review the data collected.

SURVEY RESPONSE

Sixteen full-time faculty members of the Appalachian School of Law were surveyed. There were fourteen questionnaires returned of the sixteen distributed. This revealed approximately an eighty-eight (0.875) percent response rate to the survey. Of the fourteen questionnaires returned, no respondent provided any additional characteristics for consideration. There were twenty-two characteristics surveyed and ranked. The questionnaires were distributed along with a memo addressing the nature of the survey and the assurance that the responses would be treated confidentially. The respondents were also provided with a method of anonymous return. Due to the fact that the researcher could not identify the respondent because of the random collection of the questionnaire, the researcher sent each full-time ASL faculty member a thank-you memorandum (Appendix C) for participating in the research project.

POPULATION

The total of 16 questionnaires were distributed, of which fourteen were returned and useable. Both female and male respondents were represented. The population

surveyed was between 36 – 57 years of age. All respondents were full-time faculty members.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The findings of the survey will be presented in tables. The Appendices includes two tables, Appendix D and Appendix E. Appendix D lists the top ten characteristics in order by the total number of top ten votes. There were a total of fourteen responses received and calculated for each characteristic. The questionnaire asked that each of the characteristics be ranked with one (1) being the highest to twenty-two (22) being the lowest numerical value. Those characteristics that were assigned the highest cumulative score of the top ten characteristics that will be submitted to the Faculty Recruitment Committee for inclusion in the faculty recruitment process. If the results indicated a composite that was not in the top ten ranking, they will not be recommended for inclusion in the faculty recruitment process. Appendix E will provide the findings of all of the ranked characteristics per the assignment by the current faculty members.

The researcher developed a table for the Top Ten Ranking and for a composite of the characteristics listed on the questionnaire. The results of the respondents' characteristic ranking for the Top Ten Ranking are provided in Appendix D. The Appendix D data are illustrated in Table 1, Top Ten Ranking below.

The faculty respondents have indicated that they believe that the number 1 characteristic is Law School Teaching Experience. It received the least total score of the twenty-two characteristics assessed. The number 2 ranked characteristic is Advanced Law Degrees with fifty-five total points. The 3rd ranked characteristic is Law School

Attended with sixty-eight total points. Fourth, Private Practice, and number 5, Class Ranking, received ninety-two and ninety-eight points respectively. The fourth and fifth top ranked characteristic showed an increase of over 24 points above the prior ranked characteristics. The final five of the Top Ten Characteristics in order beginning with number 6 was Curricular Demands with a 117 total score, Past Employers Evaluations with a 137 total score, Letters of Recommendation with a 142 total score, Number of Publications with a 153 total score, and Judicial Clerkships with a 165 total score. These Top Ten characteristics have been selected by the respondents as the characteristics which should be considered for inclusion in the faculty recruitment process.

Table 1, Top Ten Ranking

Characteristic	Top 10 Ranking	Total Ranking Score
Law School Teaching Experience	1	52
Advanced Law Degree	2	55
Law School Attended	3	68
Private Practice	4	92
Class Ranking	5	98
Curricular Demands	6	117
Past Employer Evaluations	7	137
Letters of Recommendation	8	142
Number of Publications	9	153
Judicial Clerkships	10	165

The second table, Appendix E, Composite Questionnaire Responses provides a complete overview of all of the respondent's results. As discussed earlier, the researcher asked the respondents to rank characteristics with one being the most popular characteristic and twenty-two the least popular characteristic. Therefore, the lowest score is ranked number one in choice and the highest score is the least popular characteristic of the twenty-second characteristics. The total score for each characteristic range from fifty-two to two hundred sixty-five. See Appendix E for a composite overview of the data collected.

The questionnaire also asked that the respondents provide any additional characteristics that the faculty member may believe to be an important characteristic. The respondents did not provide any additional characteristics on the returned questionnaires. Therefore, the researcher will not recommend additional characteristics for evaluation.

SUMMARY

This chapter presented the data collected for the research to recommend the most appropriate criteria to be used for selection of faculty applicants for the Appalachian School of Law. The survey data were analyzed to find the most frequently recognized characteristics for the faculty recruitment process. The respondents were the current faculty members of the ASL.

In order to determine the most popular characteristics, the respondents were asked to assign a numerical value to the characteristics with one the highest and twenty-two the lowest. The questionnaire was distributed to sixteen respondents and fourteen responses

were returned. Chapter IV discussed the data gathered and the significance of the information. Survey results were presented in tables along with the frequency percentage.

The final chapter of this research study will provide a summary of the study. Chapter V will analyze these findings as well as provide conclusions and recommendations. Upon completion of this project, the Appalachian School of Law will be presented with the information which may be included in the faculty selection process.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize previous chapters, to draw conclusions based on the data presented, and to make recommendations based on these conclusions.

SUMMARY

The fact that the Appalachian School of Law is currently hiring and needs to hire several additional faculty members lead to the current issue of how to select the best possible candidates for full-time faculty (tenured) positions. Candidates for faculty recruitment come from two main sources, the solicited and the unsolicited groups. The issue arose with regard to which criteria should be used for the selection of the new faculty members.

This project was developed to recommend the best criteria or characteristics to be used for selection of faculty applicants for the Appalachian School of Law. The current method uses both the solicited and the unsolicited groups. The Dean requested that the researcher evaluate the criteria used to select faculty applicants. A recommended course of action will be presented in this chapter which is supported by the researcher's project findings.

The research project used criteria that the researcher established through research and the Literature Review. The characteristics were incorporated into a questionnaire which was distributed to the current faculty members of the Law School. The

questionnaire was collected and calculated by ranking of data. The respondents were asked to provide additional characteristics to be used in the evaluation. The survey was distributed to sixteen faculty members and fourteen questionnaires were returned. The response was at a rate of 88 percent.

CONCLUSIONS

The goal of this study was to recommend the most appropriate criteria to be used for selection of faculty applicants for the Appalachian School of Law. The survey was designed using the literature and was distributed to the current faculty members. The result of the survey revealed the most important characteristics which will be recommended for evaluation of future faculty recruits. The characteristics can be used to evaluate both the solicited and unsolicited applicants. The criteria were compared to determine the top ten, most frequently ranked characteristics from a listing of twenty-two items. From those twenty-two characteristics, the top ten characteristics were established as the current faculty's most ideal characteristics for the purpose of faculty recruitment. The top ten characteristics are: (1) Law School Teaching Experience, (2) Advanced Law Degrees, (2) Law School Attended, (4) Private Practice, (5) Class Ranking, (6) Curricular Demands, (7) Past Employer Evaluations, (8) Letters of Recommendation, (9) Number of Publications, and (10) Judicial Clerkships. The questionnaire also asked that the respondent provide additional characteristics, but none were provided.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study revealed the top ten characteristics that the current faculty members of the Appalachian School of Law believed to be the most important characteristics to be used for the purpose of recruiting new faculty members. Based upon the results and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations were made:

- (1) The ASL Faculty Recruitment Committee should adopt a recruitment process which would include the most important characteristics listed from the survey.
- (2) Further research should be conducted comparing applicants selected using the top ten characteristics with those applicants using the old method of recruitment.
- (3) Additional research should be conducted to evaluate the solicited and unsolicited methods for faculty recruitment.
- (4) In addition, the study might be performed on a periodic basis to ensure that the characteristics remain productive in the faculty recruitment process.
- (5) Additional time, resource, and effort need to be given to provide a comprehensive in-depth evaluation of the interaction between the solicited and unsolicited groups.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bruce, Jon W. & Michael I. Swygert. (January 1981). "the Law Faculty Hiring Process". Houston Law Review. (Volume 18). Houston: Cornwell Press.
- Burke, Bari R. (April 1998). "AALS Releases Study Criticizing Law School Rankings". American Association of Law Schools, The Newsletter. Washington, D.C.: Foundation Press.
- Burke, Bari R. (1998, May 10). About the AALS. What Is The AALS? [Online]. Available: <http://www.aals.org/about.html>
- Chew, Pat K. (1982). "The Faculty Recruitment Process". Saint Louis University Public Law Review. (Volume 10). (pp. 247-255). Missouri: International Press.
- Christie, George C. (1987). "The Recruitment of Law Faculty". Duke Law Journal. Durham, N.C.: Duke University School of Law.
- Gest, Ted. (March 21, 1997). "Graduate School Rankings", U.S. News and World Report. (pp.46-53).
- Gordon, James D. (1993). "An Insider's Guide to the Faculty Recruitment Conference". Journal of Legal Education. Durham, N.C.: Association of American Law Schools.
- Kircher, John J. (November 1990). "Marquette Follows a Complex Multiphase Recruitment Process". Wisconsin Lawyer. (pp. 65-66). Wisconsin: Freedom Press.
- Marchese, T. J., and Lawrence, J.F. (1987). The Search Committee Handbook. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Markoff, Lisa Green. (November 20, 1989). "Candidates Shopping for Jobs at Annual AALS 'Meat Market'". The National Law Journal. New York: The New York Law Publishing Company.
- Monk, Carl C. (1997). Journal of Legal Education. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Law Schools.
- Monk, Carl C. (1998). American Association of Law Schools 1998 Handbook. Washington, D.C.: Aspen Law & Business, Legal Education Division.
- Perlman, Baron, and McCann, Lee I. (1996). Recruiting Good College Faculty. Maine: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Ryan, Michael, and Martinson, David L. (1996). "An Analysis of Faculty Recruiting in Schools and Departments". Journalism and Mass Communication Educator. Columbia, S.C.

Sutin, L. Anthony. (personal communication, December 21, 2000, Grundy, Virginia)

Thain, Gerald J. (November 1990). "U. W. Candidates Must Meet Stringent Requirements". Wisconsin Lawyer. (pp. 67-68). Wisconsin: Adams Press.

Zenoff, Elyce H. and Barron, Jerome A. (November, 1983). "So You Want to Be a Law Professor". American Bar Association Journal. (Volume 69, pp. 1712-1717). Chicago: Chicago Press.

Zillman, Don, and Angel, Marina, and Laitos, Jan, and Pring, Geroge, and Tomain, Joseph. (September, 1988). "Uncloaking Law School Hiring: A Recruit's Guide to the AALS Faculty Recruitment Conference". Journal of Legal Education. Volume 38, Number 3. Washington, D.C.: Foundation Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A -- Sample Cover letter/Memorandum

APPENDIX B -- Sample Questionnaire

APPENDIX C -- Sample Thank You Memorandum

APPENDIX D -- Top Ten Rankings Table

APPENDIX E -- Overall Results Table

APPENDIX A

Sample Cover letter/Memorandum

APPALACHIAN SCHOOL OF LAW
MEMORANDUM

TO: ASL Faculty

FROM: Vickie Keene
Director of Student Services

DATE: August 22, 2001

RE: Questionnaire

I am currently working on my master degree through Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia. Part of my required course work includes the completion of a research project. The topic that I have chosen is the "Faculty Selection Process for the Appalachian School of Law". In order to complete the project, I need your help. I am asking that each faculty member of the Appalachian School of Law complete the attached questionnaire and return it to me no later than September 10, 2001. By completing and returning the questionnaire, you can help determine which characteristics are the most important to the Law School's successful assembly of an outstanding faculty.

After the research project is completed, the results will be provided to the ASL Faculty Selection Committee for future reference in the faculty recruitment process and perhaps, in the development of an ASL faculty recruitment policy. If you are personally interested in the results of the research project, please let me know and I will also provide you with a copy of the research project.

Thank you, in advance, for taking the time to complete and return this questionnaire. Your individual responses will remain confidential.

cc: Attachment

APPENDIX B

Sample Questionnaire

Faculty Recruitment Questionnaire

Please complete the following questionnaire and return it.

What do you believe to be the most important characteristic(s) for selection of faculty candidates at the Appalachian School of Law?

Below is a list of characteristics that could be used as a tool for evaluating faculty candidates. Please read the entire list and then indicate what you think is the most important characteristic(s) by assigning a numerical value to each. Assess each characteristic by importance ranging from 1 – 22 with one (1) being the most important and twenty-two (22) the least important.)

Law School Ranking	_____	Law review experience	_____
Class ranking	_____	Law school attended	_____
Number of publications	_____	Judicial clerkships	_____
Advanced law degrees	_____	Law school teaching experience	_____
Private practice	_____	Continuing education	_____
Curricular demands	_____	Student Evaluations	_____
Order of the Coif Member	_____	Moot court success	_____
Service as a faculty research assistant	_____	Demographic changes	_____
Economic changes	_____	Minorities quotas	_____
Past employer evaluations	_____	Letters of recommendation	_____
Strategic plans for institutional needs and plans	_____		
Budgetary issues for hiring (seasoned vs. no experience)	_____		

If you believe there are additional characteristics that should be considered in the recruitment of faculty candidates at the Appalachian School of Law, please list them below.

APPENDIX C

Sample Thank You Memorandum

APPALACHIAN SCHOOL OF LAW**MEMORDANDUM**

TO: ASL Faculty

FROM: Vickie Keene
Director of Student Services

DATE: September 12, 2001

RE: Questionnaire

Thank you so much for taking the time to answer the faculty recruitment questionnaire. The information has been collected and will be calculated and analyzed. Upon completion of the research project, a recommendation of the top ten characteristics will be submitted to the Faculty Recruitment Committee. The individual responses will remain confidential. However, if you are personally interested in the results of this study, please let me know and I will provide you with the results.

Again, thank you for your assistance with this project.

APPENDIX D

Overall Results Table

Top Ten Rankings

Appendix D

40

CHARACTERISTICS	Respondent 1	Respondent 2	Respondent 3	Respondent 4	Respondent 5	Respondent 6	Respondent 7	Respondent 8	Respondent 9	Respondent 10	Respondent 11	Respondent 12	Respondent 13	Respondent 14	Total
Law School Teaching Experience	4	2	1	12	1	7	3	3	1	1	4	4	4	5	52
Advanced Law Degrees	3	1	7	9	6	2	8	1	2	5	3	3	2	3	55
Law School Attended	2	8	4	7	9	9	11	2	5	4	2	1	3	1	68
Private Practice	5	11	2	11	3	6	5	5	7	6	7	7	9	8	92
Class Ranking	21	19	3	8	8	10	10	8	3	2	1	2	1	2	98
Curricular Demands	1	4	10	2	14	5	16	10	13	9	9	6	5	13	117
Past Employer Evaluations	7	6	13	10	22	3	2	18	6	3	15	10	11	11	137
Letters of Recommendation	8	7	18	13	2	1	4	17	11	15	16	11	10	9	142
Number of Publications	18	3	5	17	12	12	14	11	8	21	8	14	6	4	153
Judicial Clerkships	12	12	8	15	11	13	13	13	17	16	6	15	7	7	165

APPENDIX E

Top Ten Rankings Table

Composite Questionnaire Responses

Appendix E

CHARACTERISTICS	Respondent 1 Respondent 2 Respondent 3 Respondent 4 Respondent 5 Respondent 6 Respondent 7 Respondent 8 Respondent 9 Respondent 10 Respondent 11 Respondent 12 Respondent 13 Total														
Law School Teaching Experience	4	2	1	12	1	7	3	3	1	1	4	4	4	5	52
Advanced Law Degrees	3	1	7	9	6	2	8	1	2	5	3	3	2	3	55
Law School Attended	2	8	4	7	9	9	11	2	5	4	2	1	3	1	68
Private Practice	5	11	2	11	3	6	5	5	7	6	7	7	9	8	92
Class Ranking	21	19	3	8	8	10	10	8	3	2	1	2	1	2	98
Curricular Demands	1	4	10	2	14	5	16	10	13	9	9	6	5	13	117
Past Employer Evaluations	7	6	13	10	22	3	2	18	6	3	15	10	11	11	137
Letters of Recommendation	8	7	18	13	2	1	4	17	11	15	16	11	10	9	142
Number of Publications	18	3	5	17	12	12	14	11	8	21	8	14	6	4	153
Judicial Clerkships	12	12	8	15	11	13	13	13	17	16	6	15	7	7	165
Law School Ranking	20	10	6	6	7	11	9	4	4	7	22	22	20	22	170
Student Evaluations	11	16	12	21	4	15	6	20	10	11	17	12	8	10	173
Continuing Education	22	22	11	19	5	4	7	14	9	10	19	17	13	20	192
Budgetary Issues for Hiring (Seasoned verses No Experience)	6	5	22	3	18	17	20	15	21	20	10	5	15	17	194
Order of the Coif Member	15	15	15	16	17	14	19	7	14	8	12	13	19	15	199
Law Review Experience	13	20	16	18	10	8	12	12	12	13	14	18	18	16	200
Minorities Quotas	9	13	9	14	19	21	21	16	16	12	11	9	16	14	200
Moot Court Success	10	9	17	20	13	18	15	19	19	22	5	8	14	19	208
Demographic Changes	14	17	19	5	21	16	1	21	20	18	20	19	12	6	209
Strategic Plans for Institutional Needs and Plans	17	14	21	1	16	19	18	6	15	19	18	21	17	18	220
Service as a Faculty Research Assistant	19	21	14	22	15	22	17	9	18	14	13	16	21	12	233
Economic Changes	16	18	20	4	20	20	22	22	22	17	21	20	22	21	265